



**Seattle Public Utilities
CSO Long-Term Control Plan
Sounding Board
Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 4901
January 25, 2011
4:45-6:50 p.m.**

Meeting Report

Meeting Attendees

Sounding Board Members:

Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Kathy Fletcher, Dusty Hoerler, Mary Junttila, Bruno Lambert, Henry McGee, Robin McKennon Thaler, Julio Moran, Tom von Schrader, Tayloe Washburn

SPU Staff, Consultant Team, King County

Trish Rhay, Susan Stoltzfus, Andrew Lee, Bill Mori, John Spencer, Jennifer Tice, Ed Mirabella, Laura Wharton

Committee Staff

Margaret Norton-Arnold, Facilitator; Fala Frazier, Committee Administrator

Welcome and Meeting Overview

Margaret welcomed everyone to the meeting. The focus of tonight's meeting will be evaluating the CSO alternatives for Planning Area #1 – Ballard/Fremont/Wallingford/Interbary area. The next Meeting, February 15, will evaluate Planning Area #2 – University/Montlake/Leschi, as well as a tunnel that would store and transport overflows from both planning areas 1 and 2. The March 8th meeting will look at Planning Area #3 – the Duwamish. Trish thanked the group for coming back and staying involved.

Rating and Weighting: Planning Area #1

John Spencer described the alternatives under consideration in Planning Area #1, which include separate storage facilities, as well as a second alternative that includes some joint storage with a King County facility. John also walked the group through the ratings that had been developed by the SPU/CH2M team. The Sounding Board discussed both these ratings, as well as different criteria weightings that changed the way in which the alternatives measured up against each other.

A copy of John's presentation is posted on the SPU website.

Sounding Board members had a number of comments on the criteria that had been used to evaluate the alternatives, as well as the ratings for each of the alternatives.

- 1) There were concerns that perhaps the criteria didn't go far enough in anticipating new water quality regulations that might be put into effect by 2025. Are we really looking out far enough, and do these alternatives fully anticipate both the flows we will have at that time and any new regulations? Are we looking out far enough into the future? For example, if we have to add ultraviolet lights or other disinfection technologies, will we have room for that at these storage facilities?
- 2) The criteria related to "Sustainable Seattle" aren't comprehensive enough. You are looking at carbon emissions for pumping, but what about the carbon emissions during construction of the projects? How is that accounted for? It seems that the carbon emissions from construction of the independent tanks would mean that alternative would be ranked lower than the joint storage alternative.
- 3) The criteria on "meeting permitting requirements" doesn't go far enough. And also, the sustainability criteria should be broader than greenhouse gases. Where is the actual measure of improvements to water quality? The actual effects on the environment and how those will be remediated through CSO control. We should be thinking about water quality, living resources, salmon – more water-related elements.
- 4) The criteria about short and long-term benefits and impacts don't do an adequate job. It seems like there is a detriment for having a pocket park or green infrastructure, and that shouldn't be the case. More green infrastructure adds value to the surrounding properties. This is what people want. This is a good thing. Yes, there will be some impacts of trucks going in and out for maintenance, but the benefits clearly outweigh the negative impacts. That needs to be reflected better in both the criteria and the ratings/weightings.
- 5) A lot of this is going to depend on the actual neighborhood where you are trying to locate these facilities. In some places, parking is at a premium, so people won't want to lose parking spaces to raingardens. In other areas of the city, new parks can be threatening, as they can be crime areas.
- 6) We need to look harder at Seattle sustainability criteria. Maybe this is the kick in the pants we need to encourage people to use cars less. But we should be looking at this from an environmental perspective, not a social perspective. Maybe we do reduce parking but encourage public transportation moving towards sustainability.
- 7) How are you describing benefits to low income or minority communities? If you want to give them a benefit, give them jobs. They don't need parks, they need jobs.
- 8) Is there any potential for joint development with these projects? If a community needed low-income housing, could we build an apartment building on top of the storage tank?
- 9) What is the city's priority and criteria around apprenticeship utilization? Where does that get figured in?

Q: Are we looking at city costs or county costs for these projects?

A: These are City costs. On the joint project, these are the city's share of the joint cost.

Q: Where you have the higher costs, why is this considered an impact on minority or low income populations?

A: Higher rates mean more impact on ratepayers. This would mean a higher impact on low income ratepayers.

Criteria Weightings from Sounding Board Members

The Sounding Board then engaged in an exercise where they applied all of their own weightings to the criteria. Differences in the alternative ratings began to emerge as these different weightings were applied. This will be explored further at the next Sounding Board meeting.

Next Steps

Margaret will write up a summary of Sounding Board comments on the ratings and weightings, and will distribute them to the group for further discussion. Email discussions will occur over the next couple of weeks, with the next meeting scheduled for February 15.